<u>REMARKS</u>

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 24, 2009. Claims 1-7, 10, and 11 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 7, 10, and 11 are independent form. Claims 1-3, 7, 10, and 11 have been amended to define aspects of Applicant's invention more clearly. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, at page 18, lines 22-26, page 22, lines 18-20, and page 23, line 24, through page 24, line 25.[1] Favorable consideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, because Claims 1, 7, 10, and 11 recite "kind of remote operation." In response, Claims 1, 7, 10, and 11 have been amended to remove recitations of "kind of." It is believed that the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, have been obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,938,154 (*Berson et al.*), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0043416 (*Rublee et al.*), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,237,023 (*Yoshimoto*); that Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Berson et al.*, in view of *Rublee et al.* and *Yoshimoto*, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163730 (*Roskind et al.*) and U.S. Patent No. 7,117,493 (*Matasushima*); that Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Berson et al.*, in view of *Rublee et al.*, *Yoshimoto*, and *Matasushima*, and

---

[1] Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

7

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,158,657 (*Okazaki et al.*); and that Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Berson et al.* in view of *Rublee et al.*, *Yoshimoto*, *Matasushima*, and *Okazaki et al.*, and further in view of *Roskind et al.* For at least the following reasons, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 7, 10, and 11, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a remote operation method of an information processing apparatus connected to an authentication apparatus and an image processing apparatus via a network. The method includes accessing the image processing apparatus.

Notably, as a response to the accessing of the image processing apparatus, remote-operating software, and data specifying the authentication apparatus, which authenticates an operation level of a remote operation, are received from the image processing apparatus. The remote-operating software enables the information processing apparatus to remotely operate the image processing apparatus. If a user inputs an instruction to operate remotely the image processing apparatus, a request for an authentication process is issued to the authentication apparatus based on the data received. The authentication process authenticates an operation level of the remote operation performed by the information processing apparatus. The image processing apparatus is remotely operated using the remote-operating software. The remote operation is executed by the remote-operating software and is permitted by the operation level authenticated in the authentication process among two or more remote operations.

Berson et al. is understood to relate to identification, management, and operation of network devices (*see* col. 1, lines 8-11). *Berson et al.* discusses a process for secure operation

8

of a network device, such as a printer, a copier, a scanner, or a facsimile machine (*see* FIG. 3). As understood by Applicant, *Berson et al.* does not teach or suggest receiving, from an image processing apparatus, remote-operating software that enables an information processing apparatus to remotely operate the image processing apparatus and data specifying an authentication apparatus authenticating an operation level of a remote operation, as a response to the information processing apparatus accessing image processing apparatus. Moreover, *Berson et al.* does not teach or suggest remote-operating software that executes a remote operation permitted by the operation level authenticated by an authentication process among two or more remote operations.

Rublee et al. is understood to relate to a system for scanning hard-copy images to electronic mail addresses (*see* paragraph 1). *Rublee et al.* discusses that a scanner sends a host name of an authentication server to a domain name server, which responds by sending a corresponding address of the authentication server to the scanner (*see* page 3, paragraph 25). The domain name server does not appear to send the address of the authentication server as a response to accessing an image processing apparatus. Nothing in *Rublee et al.* is believed to remedy the deficiencies of *Berson et al.* identified above.

Yoshimoto relates to access control of a distributed system in which resources of remote sites are shared using a computer network (*see* col. 1, lines 9-12). Nothing in *Yoshimoto* is believed to remedy the deficiencies of *Berson et al.* and *Rublee et al.* identified above.

Applicant submits that a combination of *Berson et al.*, *Rublee et al.*, and *Yoshimoto*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest a method that includes "receiving, from the image processing apparatus,

remote-operating software for the information processing apparatus to remotely operate the image processing apparatus and data specifying the authentication apparatus authenticating an operation level of a remote operation, as a response to the accessing," and "remotely operating the image processing apparatus using the remote-operating software, wherein the remote operation is executed by the remote-operating software and is permitted by the operation level authenticated in the authentication process among two or more remote operations," as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over *Berson et al.*, *Rublee et al.*, and *Yoshimoto*, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 7, 10, and 11 include features similar to those of Claim 1 and are believed to be patentable over *Berson et al.*, *Rublee et al.*, and *Yoshimoto* for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from Claim 1 and are submitted to be patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No petition to extend the time for responding to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/

_____

Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200